

FRONT PAGE

PROJECT PERIODIC REPORT

Grant Agreement number: 223758

Project acronym: PARSE.INSIGHT

Project title: INSIGHT into issues of Permanent Access to the Records of Science in Europe

Funding Scheme: Support Action (CSA-SA)

Date of latest version of Annex I against which the assessment will be made: 5 Dec 2007

Periodic report: 1st ☒ 2nd ☐ 3rd ☐ 4th ☐

Period covered: from 1 March 2008 to 28 February 2009

Name, title and organisation of the scientific representative of the project's coordinator:

Dr David Giaretta
Science and Technology Facilities Council (STFC, UK)

Tel: +44 1235 446235

Fax: +44 1235 445848

E-mail: david.giaretta@stfc.ac.uk

Project website address: www.parse-insight.eu

2. Project objectives for the period

The objectives for the first year of the project, as specified in the Description of Work, were to achieve the first two milestones: to complete the preparation phase and to conduct information gathering. Specifically, within each work package (other than WP1 Project management) the objectives for the first year were the following.

WP2 • Development of roadmap

Produce a draft roadmap for the future of digital preservation in science.

Start work on the revision of the roadmap, taking into account the findings of the community insight.

WP3 • Community insight

Identify targets for surveys of a wide range of communities with respect to their experiences, knowledge and views of digital preservation.

Design and conduct the surveys and report on the results (strictly the report was not due until Month 13).

Define the scope of the case studies in specific disciplines, complementary to the general surveys.

Set up an online forum for exchange of information and to encourage a dynamic and vibrant community in the area of digital preservation.

WP4 • Gap analysis

Specify the framework for gap analysis, identifying relevant dimensions and attributes to focus on the space between the actual situation and the ideal.

Set up appropriate tool support.

WP5 • Impact analysis

Specify metrics for the impact of decisions and actions.

WP6 • Sustainability and evaluation

Hold a workshop on sustainability, building on ongoing work on audit and certification of repositories.

WP7 • Dissemination of results

Produce the project dissemination plan.

Hold a workshop to consult on the roadmap of WP2, to expose it to targeted audiences and obtain feedback.

3. Work progress and achievements during the period

WP2 Development of roadmap

Summary of progress towards objectives and details for each task / Significant results

Work Package 2 produces one of the key outputs of PARSE.Insight, the roadmap for a support e-infrastructure for maintaining long-term accessibility and usability of scientific digital information in Europe. The roadmap is intended to present the milestones towards achieving such an infrastructure, allowing rational decisions to be taken on the steps to achieve them.

The original view the development of the roadmap, expressed in the Description of Work, called for an initial review of existing roadmaps and the production of an initial synthesis, which would constitute the ‘draft roadmap’. The rationale was that many roadmaps had already been produced with some connection with digital preservation, albeit varying widely in scope, timescale, level of detail, etc. By reviewing these, it would be possible to ensure that all relevant areas of enquiry would be covered in WP3, and also to identify areas of inconsistency or conflict that would merit further investigation. The project did indeed assemble a comprehensive collection of existing roadmaps, which is maintained on the project wiki. However the timings changed, particularly with respect to WP3 on community insight. The wide and rapid response to the surveys enabled the project to adopt a more direct approach to the roadmap.

Rather than synthesizing existing roadmaps, the approach related more directly to the community insight by formulating the roadmap in terms of challenges or threats to preservation. Seven high-level threats were identified. These could be used within the surveys (because it is easy for interested parties to relate to these threats, even if they have not particularly concerned themselves with digital preservation previously). They could also be used to structure and develop the draft roadmap, because they imply requirements for solutions.

Underlying all of the work of WP2 is the ISO standard OAIS Reference Model, which provides the conceptual framework and terminology needed—for example, the ideas of Representation Information.

Task 2.1: Survey of existing roadmaps (lead: FUH)

An initial set of relevant roadmaps and related inputs was collected on the project wiki. These include items that are explicitly labelled as roadmaps, such as those of DPE, e-IRG and ESFRI; others that focus on requirements for preservation or curation; others that attempt to define e-infrastructures; and some miscellaneous items.

The study of these inputs, and reflection on the part of the project team, resulted in a conception of e-infrastructure as a set of components aimed at bridging the gaps between islands of functionality, developed for particular purposes, often by other European projects, whether separated by discipline or time. (It is the time aspect that is the particular concern of preservation, of course.)

Task 2.2: Initial synthesis of roadmaps (lead: STFC) and Task 2.3: Revised roadmap (lead: ESA)

As mentioned above, the approach to the roadmap changed as the project got under way, with the result that the draft roadmap was not simply a synthesis of existing work. The requirements for the science data infrastructure were expressed in terms of threats to preservation, access and reuse. It was realised that by thinking in terms of such threats, it would be possible to link the roadmap and survey in a very natural way: stakeholders can relate directly to threats, and the solutions required to counter the threats are the components of the infrastructure, or at least can be mapped to those components.

The components of the infrastructure were then divided into a number of broad classes:

- financial;
- organisational/social;
- policy;
- virtualisation;
- technical.

As it currently exists, the draft roadmap has most detail about the technical components, which as already explained arise from an analysis of threats to preservation. Nonetheless the surveys of WP3 have also given valuable input to the other components, for example in what they have shown about the reuse of scientific data, whether actual or desired. The technical components are illustrated in terms of scenarios, and current relevant work is mentioned.

The PARSE.Insight roadmap has been influenced by the proceedings of a consultation meeting organised by the EC in Lyon on 24 November 2008, at which Dr. David Giaretta acted as a rapporteur. In consultation with the Project Officer, the project team saw an opportunity to reorient the project within the wider context of science data infrastructure, in which preservation is considered as part of a bigger picture of preservation, reuse and (open) access, rather than in isolation.

The draft roadmap became an evolving document, developed collaboratively by the project partners, and released publicly in Month 12 of the project. This is deliverable D2.1 ‘Draft roadmap’. It was published on the project’s public website in March 2009.

The draft roadmap is a suitable basis for engaging stakeholders towards the completion of the roadmap planned for the remainder of the project. In particular, a Task Group has been created within the Alliance for Permanent Access to the Records of Science (<http://www.alliancepermanentaccess.eu>) specifically for this purpose.

In addition to the roadmap document itself, a comprehensive glossary of terms related to digital preservation is under construction.

Deviations from DoW / Impact on other tasks

As explained above, the draft roadmap was not submitted as a formal deliverable at the planned date of Month 3. Instead it was developed as an evolving document that was publicly released—in a much more advanced state than originally envisaged—at Month 12. This has no direct consequences for deliverables in WP2, as the revised strategic roadmap is not due until the end of the project. WP2 feeds into the gap analysis of WP4, and this work package has been taking into account the evolving roadmap.

It was originally expected that the draft roadmap would feed into the development of the surveys of WP3. However this dependency was not as strong as expected, and it was possible to develop comprehensive surveys without the existence of the formal deliverable.

It was originally planned to hold a workshop on the roadmap before the end of the first year. The aim is to expose the work of the project to targetted audiences and obtain feedback to advance the next stage of the project. Owing to the dependence on external parties, principally the National Science Foundation in the USA, it has not yet been possible to hold this workshop. However it is hoped to hold it later in 2009.

More generally, the scope of the PARSE.Insight project has been broadened to encompass science data infrastructure. A significant event in this respect was the EC workshop held in Lyon in November 2008. This was an opportunity to feed the emerging results of the community work into the discussions, and to take into account the perspectives of the other participants in the roadmap.

Use of resources (including actual vs. planned)

Table of person-months per partner compared with DoW (total for whole project)

	Beneficiary	Person-months spent in first year	Total person-months in WP from DoW
1	STFC	0.9	6
2	KB	0.27	1
3	DNB	0.65	2
4	MPG	0.14	1
5	STM	0.66	1
6	ESA	2.7	2
7	FUH	1.35	5
8	CERN	6.5	3
9	UGOE	5.0	0

WP3 Community insight

Summary of progress towards objectives and details for each task / Significant results

The objective of the Community Insight work package (WP3) is to provide information that is needed to perform a gap analysis and refine the roadmap within PARSE.Insight. For that objective information needs to be gathered on several aspects related to digital preservation and access in Europe's science landscape. These aspects include the perceptions of the importance of digital preservation, current practices, enhancement factors and impediments, the funding expected to be available for preservation, and factors influencing those decisions. We have used a number of methods to determine the present state of affairs regarding digital preservation—surveys (online questionnaires), desk research, interviews, and case studies.

Task 3.1: Design and implementation of a platform to support surveys and forum (lead: KB)

Extensive desk research has been undertaken to understand the current state of affairs regarding long term preservation in Europe. As not all information is readily available, surveys are needed to quantify the state of affairs in Europe. Deliverable D3.1 'Survey and forum platforms' focuses on the process of gaining insight using surveys. To ease the large scale process of analysis, the online survey tool SurveyMonkey was selected to distribute the questionnaire. Deliverable D3.1 records the review process for the survey tool and justifies the choices made. This is a first year deliverable and has been submitted.

The second objective of this task is focused on the development of a forum for digital preservation targeted on the stakeholders in research. Therefore, a proposal has been written for developing an online forum which will offer the ability to exchange valuable information about digital preservation practices, policies, tools and other related topics. To make this forum sustainable and monitored, WP3 is in contact with the European Alliance for Permanent Access. See also D3.1.

Task 3.2: Identification of survey targets (lead: MPG)

To start gaining insight into digital preservation in research, WP3 first identified the main stakeholders in research in Europe: researchers, data managers, publishers and funding agencies. To keep track of all stakeholders an online contacts database has been created and a description of all stakeholders and research disciplines has been listed (part of D3.2). Deliverable D3.2 'Identification of survey targets' outlines the activities of this task. D3.2 is being submitted, though it does not yet cover the proposed interactive map which will follow later.

Task 3.3: Design, publish and process surveys with specific targeting (lead: KB)

WP3 circulated four major questionnaires among a large group of stakeholders. In various sessions with a review panel the questionnaires were developed that were specifically targeted to the stakeholders in research (the scientists themselves), data managers, funders and publishers. Thousands of researchers, publishers, data managers and funders have been contacted through a large number of channels. To name a few: Elsevier, EURODOC and MCFA for the researchers survey; International STM Association and Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ) for the publishers survey; ESF for the funders survey; LIBER for the data managers survey. In addition a merged survey (incorporating all four surveys) has been sent to several general mailing lists.

All general surveys are closed now. In total around 2000 responses have been gathered for the general survey plus about 1000 responses from the discipline specific surveys. Currently, analysis of the survey results is in progress. As the creation and distribution of the survey took longer than expected, deliverable D3.4 'Survey report' is expected at the end of May 2009 (M14).

In the light of the upcoming deliverable D3.5 'Insight report' (M18, September 2009) we are currently preparing interviews to deepen and broaden the insight gained from the collected survey data.

Task 3.4: Identify and perform case studies (lead: CERN)

Aside from the general survey, three case studies are being conducted that look into the following research disciplines:

- High Energy Physics conducted by project partner CERN
- Earth Sciences conducted by project partner ESA
- Social Sciences & Humanities conducted by MPG and DNB

The case studies aim at providing more in-depth insight into the practices and needs of a selective number of specific scientific communities. All case studies have similar methodologies: desk research, online surveys, and interviews.

Within all case studies, desk research has been done. Except for the Earth Sciences survey, all surveys have been conducted and the evaluation of the responses is under way. Preparations are currently made for interviews in the case studies. Deliverable D3.3 'Case studies report' is expected to be ready in August 2009 (M17).

The Earth Sciences case study has identified the boundaries of the selected case study in Earth Science. The activities on-going at ESA on the long-term preservation of remotely sensed and environmental data and the users involved have been illustrated to the other partners. Following a precise strategy, ESA has run a set of activities focussed on 'preparing the terrain' to survey external Earth Science users about the preservation of environmental data in the most profitable way; to this end a questionnaire focused on the Earth Science context has been prepared. At the closure of that questionnaire, foreseen by M15, the survey activity, including analysis and elaboration of results, will integrate as much as possible with on-going activities at ESA bringing the most from the PARSE.Insight Support Action.

The social sciences and humanities case study is divided into two sub case studies: psycholinguistics and book studies. As these were not specified in the original description of work, the following motivation is given:

The case studies on Psycholinguistics and Book Studies represent the spectrum of Humanities and Social Sciences together. On the one hand, both communities have in common that they work with digital objects, are well connected and already have a rudimentary e-infrastructure for scientific data.

On the other hand there is an important difference between the data used: the Psycholinguistics normally creates its own data during experiments and/or observations, while book studies on the contrary generally work with digitized objects provided by a third party.

Both communities received a survey which took place in winter/springtime 2009. The Psycholinguistic survey has been composed of different parts for researchers and data managers. Because of the small size of the community, the Book Studies survey did not make this distinction. The circulation of the Book Study survey was supported by the biggest international association of researchers on the book, SHARP (Society for the History of Authorship, Reading and Publishing). The circulation of the Psycholinguistic survey was supported by national cognitive linguistics associations. Around 205 completed responses on Psycholinguistics and 124 completed responses for Book Studies were received. Early analysis shows that there is an interest in concerns of long-term preservation of scientific data and the awareness that efforts are needed to shape the e-infrastructure for these data.

Interviews with data managers and researchers are going to deliver more detailed results and representative examples of best practices in coming months.

Task 3.5: Produce Insight report from survey results and case studies (lead: KB)

This task has not yet started.

Deviations from DoW / Impact on other tasks

Due to extensive but useful discussions about the scale and approach for gaining insight in Europe's research landscape, all deliverables in WP3 for the first year are delayed. Surveying the whole of Europe is a daunting task. It took a lot of effort to find the right strategy. The end result (D3.5), however, is expected to be finished in time (M18, Sept 2009).

The description of deliverable D3.2 in the DoW states that this deliverable should incorporate an *interactive map of key players and respective topics*, and a *searchable database of R&D activity in Digital Preservation related technologies*. Due to the scale of these two sub deliverables they are still under development and will be incorporated in the next iteration of D3.2.

Use of resources (including actual vs. planned)

Table of person-months per partner compared with DoW (total for whole project)

	Beneficiary	Person-months spent in first year	Total person-months in WP from DoW
1	STFC	3.6	3
2	KB	7.93	16
3	DNB	2.1	2.5
4	MPG	5.18	2.5
5	STM	2.25	2
6	ESA	8.06	8
7	FUH	0.5	4
8	CERN	10.46	15
9	UGOE	5.03	2.5

WP4 Gap analysis

Summary of progress towards objectives and details for each task / Significant results

The gap analysis compares the roadmap with the inventory of existing and planned capabilities. It will allow the EU, and others, to focus resources where they are most needed in order to develop the full preservation e-infrastructure required.

Meetings and phone conferences within the consortium:

- Workshop (Feb., 10th 2009) on first preliminary results of the gap analysis in publishing and libraries in Darmstadt
- Phone conference (Jan., 14th 2009) on the usage of survey data within in the gap analysis tool

Overview of main achievements:

- Gap analysis framework developed
- Gap types identified
- Concept and user interfaces for the IT tool support developed

Task 4.1: Specification of the gap analysis framework (lead: STFC)

A formal gap analysis framework was developed by eliciting and structuring relevant dimensions and corresponding attributes, and to develop a stepwise, systematic procedure for assessing discrepancies between the requirements for permanent access and the actual European e-infrastructures landscape.

Different *gap types* were identified relating to the different stages of diffusion of the concept of 'long-term preservation of scientific data'. The gaps are expected to be between different sectors and communities.

The (interim) results were *fed back* into consultation cycles and validated by the associated target communities. The associated multi-dimensional data and the corresponding models will serve as the baseline for the application of gap analysis in WP4.3.

Deliverable D4.1 'Specification of gap analysis schema and tool support' was prepared and submitted.

Task 4.2: Provision of appropriate technology support for gap analysis (leader: FUH)

FUH assessed different technologies for an IT support of the gap analysis, focusing on data management, analysis and experimentation. The concept of an IT tool for supporting the gap analysis across different sectors was developed and prototypes of user interfaces were designed. The tool is designed to build upon the data from WP2 'Community insight'.

A concept for connecting the gap analysis with the impact analysis (WP 5) was also developed. For this different methods for analyzing cause-effect-relationships were compared and the Analytical-Hierarchy-Process was chosen as the most appropriate method.

Task 4.3: Application of gap analysis (lead: FUH)

As a preparation for the first application of the gap analysis an appropriate sector was to be selected. 'Publishers' and 'libraries' are chosen for the first application for two reasons: Firstly the survey results from WP3 offers a good and representative coverage of the entire market. Secondly a group

of interested participants from this sector have offered their cooperation for testing the gap analysis framework. The so obtained validation results will support the dissemination into other sectors. As a preparation for WP4.3 a workshop is planned with publishers and libraries to verify and discuss the preliminary identified gaps.

Task 4.4: Consultation on gap analysis (lead: CERN)

This task has not yet started.

Deviations from DoW / Impact on other tasks

All activities in WP4.1 are on track and in line with the DoW. However, since it is proposed to reduce WP5 to a minimum the further IT tool support for the impact analysis is no longer reasonable. Efforts will be shifted to other work packages.

Use of resources (including actual vs. planned)

Table of person-months per partner compared with DoW (total for whole project)

	Beneficiary	Person-months spent in first year	Total person-months in WP from DoW
1	STFC	0.05	4
2	KB	0.07	2
3	DNB	0.4	2
4	MPG	—	0
5	STM	0.25	0.5
6	ESA	0.8	2
7	FUH	3.31	8
8	CERN	0.12	3
9	UGOE	0.05	1

WP5 Impact analysis

There has been an important change in the project with respect to this Work Package. In fact, in the light of the proposed reorientation of the project towards general science data (see section 5 on project management for more on this), the project team intends to eliminate this Work Package altogether and refocus effort elsewhere.

In the Description of Work, the impact analysis was intended to provide a framework for the consequences of following the roadmap (or of not following it), allowing comparison of different future scenarios. This was envisaged as a rather quantitative, metrics-based activity including the development of a software tool. In the light of the proposed reorientation, it is considered that the effort of this Work Package would be better expended on broadening and deepening the community insight and on a more qualitative approach to illustrating the consequences of the roadmap, absorbed into other Work Packages.

A small amount of effort was spent in the preliminary stages of this Work Package.

Use of resources (including actual vs. planned)

	Beneficiary	Person-months spent in first year	Total person-months in WP from DoW
1	STFC	—	3
2	KB	—	0
3	DNB	—	2
4	MPG	—	2
5	STM	—	1
6	ESA	—	3
7	FUH	1.0	4
8	CERN	1.47	4
9	UGOE	—	5

WP6 Sustainability and evaluation

This work package has two strands. The first is to help to identify best practice among existing digital repositories. The second is to help to reach a common understanding of mechanisms to evaluate the sustainability and trustworthiness of e-infrastructure repositories.

During the first year of the project most of the WP6 effort has been on the work towards an audit/certification standard (tasks 6.1 and 6.3) while task 6.2 required a minimum effort. Actually, task 6.2 strongly depends on input from tasks 6.1 and 6.3 about the progress of the audit/certification standard, and on the results from WP3, which started to be identified and detailed after M12 for all the project's case studies.

In the next months it will be dedicated to examine legal/financial/organisational aspects of the roadmap to identify constraints, implementation mechanisms and cooperation between stakeholders.

Summary of progress towards objectives and details for each task / Significant results

Task 6.1: Build on ongoing certification work (lead: STFC)

To progress the work towards an ISO standard for audit and certification of digital repositories, a Working Group within the Consultative Committee on Space Data Systems (CCSDS) was set up, with its charter agreed in January 2007. The group's work is based on the TRAC document (available at <http://www.crl.edu/PDF/trac.pdf>), with the aim of reviewing and refining the criteria therein.

The group is following an open process with a publicly accessible wiki at <http://www.digitalrepositoryauditandcertification.org>. Weekly online discussions take place, covering the evolving criteria and other documentation required. The notes are recorded on the wiki with all working documents. Two documents are being edited:

- *Metrics for Digital Repository Audit and Certification*. This is the basic document that lists the criteria against which a repository will be judged.
- *Requirements for Bodies Providing Audit and Certification of Digital Repositories*. An additional document setting out requirements on those organizations that provide the audit and certification of repositories. Clearly such bodies themselves must be properly constituted and effectively managed.

Task 6.1 in PARSE.Insight called for an international expert workshop to progress this work, involving key players from the EU and USA plus others. The workshop took place on 11–13 February 2009 at the National Archives at College Park in Maryland, USA, and made good progress in editing the documents, which are now close to being submitted to the ISO review process. Deliverable D6.1 is the record of the workshop.

Task 6.2: Sustainability (lead: ESA)

There has been little effort on this task in the first year.

Task 6.3: Evaluation process (lead: STFC)

This task is just starting.

Deviations from DoW / Impact on other tasks

Task 6.2 did not start in the first year, but will now commence in the second year of the project.

Use of resources (including actual vs. planned)

Table of person-months per partner compared with DoW (total for whole project)

	Beneficiary	Person-months spent in first year	Total person- months in WP from DoW
1	STFC	0.25 *	4
2	KB	—	0
3	DNB	—	0
4	MPG	—	1
5	STM	—	0.5
6	ESA	0.6	2
7	FUH	—	0
8	CERN	0.03	0
9	UGOE	—	1

* This is an underrepresentation of the effort spent, since much of the work towards an international standard is being carried out in the scope of another project, CASPAR.

WP7 Dissemination of results

Summary of progress towards objectives and details for each task / Significant results

The aim of WP7 is to disseminate the results of the project via two main lines of communication, (a) internal communication amongst the partners and (b) dissemination towards the main stakeholders in scientific information. The dissemination of the aims and both partial and final results of the project at various stages of realization is one of the basic goals of the dissemination strategy.

The external dissemination is divided in three phases:

- In the beginning of the project, the focus lies on the presentation of the project itself so that it is well-known within the community.
- In the second half of the project, the emphasis lies on the dissemination of the results from the general survey and the case studies (including dissemination through workshops).
- At the end of the project, the final results of the project, that is the road-map and the recommendations, will be disseminated (including dissemination through workshops).

PARSE.Insight has produced a Dissemination Plan (D7.1). This report describes the internal and external dissemination strategies and initiatives of the project covering the whole duration of the project and the material used for various dissemination tasks. It will be continually supplemented with new information about dissemination activities that have been already realized.

Dissemination activities from the beginning of the project until 28 February 2009:

Internal Dissemination:

The project partners use an internal mailing list and a wiki and also stay in contact via face-to-face meetings every three months as well as via bi-weekly telephone conferences.

External Dissemination:

The PARSE.Insight website (<http://www.parse-insight.eu/>) offers information about the project and its partners and presents the results of both the project itself and the workshops. All public reports will be available on this website.

A few months after the beginning of the project PARSE.Insight a new project logo was designed by DNB, which is used for all project events and activities (e.g. presentations, publications, leaflets and the website).

Within the first year there have been numerous dissemination activities (for more detailed information please see deliverable D7.1 'Dissemination plan'):

Talks/presentations: So far, PARSE.Insight has been the subject of 12 presentations given by the project partners.

Mailing lists: PARSE.Insight informed the public about results of the project by using existent mailing lists concerning librarianship, long-term preservation and archivistics. Up to now, there have been two announcements via these mailing lists (overview about the project, information about the start of the general survey).

Poster: WP7 has created a poster which contains basic information about the project (A0). It has been used as a leaflet as well (printed in A4). So far, the poster (A0 and A4) has been presented on eight national and international conferences.

Publications: PARSE.Insight disseminated partial results in relevant journals and newsletters. Until now, there have been 10 publications.

Leaflet: The leaflet created by WP7 is nearly ready for printing. It informs about first results and the outcome of the project and will be distributed at every opportunity by the project partners.

Deviations from DoW / Impact on other tasks

The DoW gives three workshops (Roadmap workshop, Insight workshop, Gap Workshop) to disseminate the results of the project. According to DoW, the workshops will be organized by CERN, KB and FUH.

The project partners decided during their work to deviate from the plans described in DoW with regard to content and organization of the workshops. Instead, the following workshops will take place:

- The Insight workshop and the Gap workshop will be held together. The Insight/Gap workshop will take place in September 2009, possibly combined with a CASPAR project final event (organized by KB/FUH).
- The date of the Roadmap Workshop (together with a NSF event) is still under discussion but is intended to be held in 2009 (organized by STFC).
- The project partners decided to organize an overall PARSE.Insight closing workshop in February 2010 (organized by CERN).

Use of resources (including actual vs. planned)

Table of person-months per partner compared with DoW (total for whole project)

	Beneficiary	Person-months spent in first year	Total person-months in WP from DoW
1	STFC	0.1	2
2	KB	0.26	2
3	DNB	— *	0
4	MPG	1.65	5
5	STM	0.25	0,5
6	ESA	1.43	2
7	FUH	0.7	2
8	CERN	0.56	4
9	UGOE	1.48	2

* Note: The work package lead and the DNB made an agreement that DNB will spend efforts in dissemination as well but without shifting efforts from another work package to WP7.

4. Deliverables and milestones tables

Deliverables (excluding the periodic and final reports)

TABLE 1. DELIVERABLES¹									
Del. no.	Deliverable name	WP no.	Lead beneficiary	Nature	Dissemination level	Delivery date from Annex I (proj month)	Delivered Yes/No	Actual / Forecast delivery date	Comments
D2.1	Draft roadmap	WP2	STFC	R	Public	3	Yes	12	See WP2 report for the changed conception of the draft roadmap.
D3.1	Survey and forum platforms	WP3	KB	R/O	Public	3	Yes	12	Survey platform selection done on time but deliverable submitted later; forum depends on negotiations with Alliance for Permanent Access
D3.2	Inventory of communities	WP3	MPG	R	Public	4	Yes	12	The work was achieved on time but the deliverable only submitted later
D7.1	Dissemination plan	WP7	MPG	R	Public	4	Yes	12	Regarded as an evolving document, including record of dissemination activities
D4.1	Gap analysis framework specification	WP4	STFC	R	Public	10	Yes	12	
D7.2	Roadmap workshop	WP7	STFC	R	Public	10	No	TBD	Timing of roadmap workshop dependent on external parties—see comments in WP7 and management reports

¹ For Security Projects the template for the deliverables list in Annex A1 has to be used.

D3.3	Case study reports	WP3	CERN	R	Public	12	No	17	Deliverable delayed due to good responses to case studies requiring more analysis time
D6.1	Workshop report	WP6	STFC	R	Public	12	Yes	12	

Milestones

TABLE 2. MILESTONES							
Milestone no.	Milestone name	Work package no	Lead beneficiary	Delivery date from Annex I	Achieved Yes/No	Actual / Forecast achievement date	Comments
1	Preparation	WP1, WP2	STFC	Month 4	Yes		
2	Information gathering	WP3, WP5	KB	Month 11	Yes		The information gathering has been a great success (e.g. number of responses to surveys), and will continue with interviews and more work on the case studies.